

TEEN PARENT PROGRAM

OUTCOME REPORT (April 2006 Cohort)

**Data Prepared by
Michigan Department of Human Services
Performance Excellence Administration**

January 2007

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
SECTION I: CONTRACTUAL CRITERIA	9
A. SELF-SUFFICIENCY	10
CRITERION #1: EDUCATION	10
CRITERION #2: EDUCATION, TRAINING PROGRAMS, & EMPLOYMENT	11
CRITERION #10: EDUCATION/EMPLOYMENT SIX MONTHS AFTER CLOSURE	11
B. PREGNANCY-RELATED CONCERNS	12
CRITERION #3: REPEAT PREGNANCIES	12
CRITERION #4: PRENATAL CARE	13
CRITERION #5: FULL-TERM INFANTS	13
C. HEALTH & PARENTING ISSUES	14
CRITERION #6: IMMUNIZATIONS/COMPREHENSIVE MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.....	14
CRITERION #7: CHILD DEVELOPMENT & PARENTING EDUCATION	15
CRITERION #8: CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT	15
CRITERION #11: CHILD ABUSE OR NEGLECT - CLOSED CASES	18
D. PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION	19
CRITERION #9: PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION	19
SECTION II: EDUCATIONAL & EMPLOYMENT PURSUITS IN FURTHER DETAIL.....	21
A. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: DROP OUT	22
B. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: ENROLLED IN SCHOOL.....	23
C. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: GED TRAINING/CLASSES	24
D. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: SCHOOL AND GED TRAINING/CLASSES	25

E. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: HS GRADUATE/GED HOLDER	25
F. EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT INAKE AND AT REPORT DATE	26
SECTION III: SUPPORT SERVICES.....	27
SECTION IV: REASONS BEHIND CASE CLOSURES	33

TEEN PARENT PROGRAM (TPP)

April 2006 Cohort¹

Executive Summary

The Michigan Department of Human Services' on-going monitoring of its Teen Parent Program (TPP) began October 1, 1994. The most recent contract period began October 1, 2005. This new contract period witnessed the inclusion of two new counties and twelve new service providers. The program operates via contract with twenty-three sites (23) in twenty (20) counties. The specific counties served by the program are Berrien, Calhoun, Chippewa, Clare, Genesee, Ingham, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Kent, Lake, Macomb, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oakland, Ogemaw, Ottawa, Saginaw, Van Buren, and Wayne, which is home to four sites.

This document presents information related to the Teen Parent Program for the April 2006 reporting cohort. The population under study includes cases carried over from the previous fiscal year², as well as those new cases entering the program during the months of October 2005 – February 2006. All totaled, 1,164 data collection forms were analyzed.

Section I: Contractual Criteria

In terms of the contractual criteria, the Apr06 cohort achieved the following results:

- **CRITERION #1:** Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teen parents who have not completed high school will attend school, full-time, or GED classes within four months of entry to the Teen Parent Program.

71.8% of the Apr06 cohort who had not completed high school was enrolled in educational activities within four months of program entry. An additional 3.0% became involved in educational activities beyond the fourth month.

- **CRITERION #2:** Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teen parents will be involved in education or training programs, or will be employed, within four (4) months of program entry.

74.3% of the Apr06 cohort was involved in educational, training or employment activities within four months of program entry. An additional 5.6% became involved in such activities beyond the fourth month.

¹ Data Source: Teen Parent Program Semi-Annual Monitoring Reports for April 2006. This outcome report is the first such report for the contract period which began October 1, 2005.

² Caveat: in keeping with previous semi-annual reporting cycles, those carryover cases closed during October 2005 (which would have been a reporting cycle had there not been such turnover amongst providers with the start of the new contract) were excluded from the analysis.

- **CRITERION #3:** Eighty-five percent (85%) of the participating teen parents who are not pregnant at the time of program entry will not become pregnant within twelve (12) months of program entry.

86.9% of the Apr06 cohort, who were not pregnant at program entry, did not become pregnant within twelve months of program entry.

- **CRITERION #4:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen mothers who are pregnant at the time of program entry will participate in prenatal care.

99.2% of the teen mothers who were pregnant at the time of program entry participated in prenatal care.

- **CRITERION #5:** Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teen parents who are pregnant at the time of program entry will deliver full-term infants.

89.6% of the teen parents who were pregnant at the time of program entry delivered full-term infants.

- **CRITERION #6:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parent's children/infants³ will be referred and/or receive comprehensive medical examinations and/or immunizations within two (2) months of entry into the Teen Parent Program.

67.8% of the teens' children/infants were either referred for or started receiving immunizations within two months of program entry, with an additional 24.1% having been referred for or started receiving said service beyond the second month. Overall, regardless of time frame, 91.9% of the teens' children/infants were referred for or started receiving immunizations.

65.4% of the teens' children/infants were either referred for or started receiving comprehensive medical examinations within two months of program entry, with an additional 23.8% having been referred for or started receiving said service beyond the second month. Overall, regardless of time frame, 89.2% of the teens' children/infants were referred for or started receiving comprehensive medical examinations.

- **CRITERION #7:** Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teen parents and/or their children ages 0-3 years will be referred and/or receive child development and parenting education within three months of program entry.

³ *CRITERION #6: Data collection regarding immunizations and comprehensive medical examination participation focused on the youngest child in the family.*

88.1% of the teen parents and/or their children were either referred for or started receiving child development education within three months of program entry, with an additional 5.0% having been referred for or started receipt of said service beyond the third month. Overall, regardless of time frame, 93.2% of the teens and/or their children were referred for or started receiving child development education.

90.9% of the teen parents and/or their children were either referred for or started receiving parenting education within three months of program entry, with an additional 4.4% having been referred for or started receipt of said service beyond the third month. Overall, regardless of time frame, 95.3% of the teens and/or their children were referred for or started receiving parenting education.

- **CRITERION #8:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parents will not have a “preponderance of evidence” child abuse or neglect finding for one (1) year from date of entry into the program.

97.3% of the teen parents did not have a “preponderance of evidence” child abuse or neglect finding for one year from date of entry into the program.

- **CRITERION #9:** Seventy-five percent (75%) of participants will self-report satisfaction with services provided by the program.

99.6% of survey respondents indicated that they were either “very satisfied” (83.2%) or “somewhat satisfied” (16.4%) with the services received through the program⁴.

- **CRITERION #10:** Eighty-five percent (85%) of participants will be involved in school and/or work full-time six months after completion/termination of the program⁵.

Overall, 82.0% of former participants, who were able to be located and contacted for data collection purposes, were involved in educational, skills training, and/or employment activities six months after completion/termination of the program.

⁴ As reported by respondents to the Teen Parent Program Participant Satisfaction Survey that was administered by TPP sites during the second quarter of FY06, (i.e., January, February and March 2006).

⁵ Data source: Teen Parent Program Monitoring – Follow-up Form for Closed Cases. This form is completed by the TPP agency six months after a case has closed to the program. Agency representatives have the entire reporting month to try to locate the former participant and complete the form.

- **CRITERION #11:** Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parents will not have a “preponderance of evidence” finding of child abuse or neglect six months following completion of services.

98.5% of the teen parents did not have a “preponderance of evidence” finding of child abuse or neglect six months following completion of services.

Section II: Educational & Employment Pursuits in Further Detail

Closer examination of the educational and employment status of program participants revealed the following:

1. 33.5% of the participants, upon entering the program, were identified as school dropouts.
 - By the semi-annual reporting date, 20.1% of these “dropouts” were re-enrolled in school, with 77.0% of these experiencing continuous enrollments (i.e., no excessive breaks or absences).
 - Of those not re-enrolled in school at the report date (having been identified as “dropouts” at intake), 10.4% had actually re-enrolled in school and earned a degree or GED sometime during the six-month period prior to the report date. In addition, 17.8% of those not re-enrolled cited barriers to school enrollment that were beyond their control⁶.
2. 47.2% of the participants were enrolled in school at the time they entered the program.
 - By the semi-annual reporting date, 66.5% of these participants were still enrolled in school, with 81.4% of these experiencing continuous enrollments.
 - Of those enrolled in school at intake, but not enrolled in school at the report date, 37.9% had actually earned a degree or GED sometime during the six-month period prior to the report date. Meanwhile, 12.4% of those not enrolled as of the report date cited barriers to school “re-”enrollment that were beyond their control.
3. 10.0% of the participants were high school graduates, 1.6% were GED holders, and 2.1% were either high school graduates or GED holders **and** attending college at the time they entered the program.
4. There was a 72.6% increase in the number of participants employed from intake to report date.

⁶ A number of barriers to education were identified including such things as transportation, child care, lack of familial support, housing issues, and medical issues.

Section III: Support Services

The teen parent provider agencies provide a number of additional support services to the program participants. In terms of direct service provision, the agencies provided 80.0% or more of the following services:

- Transportation (97.2% of these services provided directly by the TPP agencies).
- Support Groups (95.5%)
- Parenting Classes (91.4%)
- Nutrition Classes (88.0%)
- Emergency Services/24-Hour Crisis Intervention (84.4%)
- Teen Father Services (83.3%)
- Transitional Housing (80.7%)
- Substance Abuse Services (80.6%)

Section IV: Reasons Behind Case Closures (n=371)

Up to three possible explanations could be provided as to why cases closed. Given that the Teen Parent Program is a voluntary program, it is not surprising to learn that, in 75.2% of the closed cases, the participant quit or the case was closed due to inactivity on behalf of the participant.

SECTION I:
CONTRACTUAL CRITERIA

The Michigan Department of Human Services' on-going monitoring of its Teen Parent Program (TPP) began October 1, 1994. The most recent contract period began October 1, 2005. This new contract period witnessed the inclusion of two new counties and twelve new service providers. The program operates via contract with twenty-three sites (23) in twenty (20) counties. The specific counties served by the program are Berrien, Calhoun, Chippewa, Clare, Genesee, Ingham, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Kent, Lake, Macomb, Montcalm, Muskegon, Newaygo, Oakland, Ogemaw, Ottawa, Saginaw, Van Buren, and Wayne, which is home to four sites.

This document presents information related to the Teen Parent Program for the April 2006 reporting cohort. The population under study includes cases carried over from the previous fiscal year⁷, as well as those new cases entering the program during the months of October 2005 – February 2006. All totaled, 1,164 data collection forms were analyzed.

General findings with respect to each of eleven contractual criteria are presented below. These eleven criteria address such items as self-sufficiency, pregnancy-related concerns, health issues, and participant satisfaction with the program.

A. SELF-SUFFICIENCY

CRITERION #1: Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teen parents who have not completed high school will attend school, full-time, or GED classes within four months of entry to the Teen Parent Program.

Report Month / Year ⁸	Number who have not completed high school	Involvement in Educational Activity AT INTAKE or WITHIN Four Months		Involvement in Educational Activity BEYOND Four Months	
		N	%	N	%
Apr06	985	707	71.8	30	3.0

- This criterion serves as a simple “point in time” measure of the number of teens enrolled in elementary or secondary school (or GED training/classes) within four months of entering the program. It does not address the issue of consistency in enrollment. Indeed, many of the teens experience numerous stops and starts when it comes to school or GED training/classes. The issue of continuity in enrollment is addressed further in Section II of this document, which begins on page 21.

⁷ Caveat: in keeping with previous semi-annual reporting cycles, those carryover cases closed during October 2005 (which would have been a reporting cycle had there not been such turnover amongst providers with the start of the new contract) were excluded from the analysis.

⁸ CRITERION #1: The APR06 cohort had one additional individual involved in an activity; however, the time frame was indeterminate.

CRITERION #2: Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teen parents will be involved in education or training programs, or will be employed, within four (4) months of program entry.

Report Month / Year ⁹	Number of TPP Participants	Involvement in Educational/Training/Employment Activity AT INTAKE or WITHIN Four Months		Involvement in Educational/Training/Employment Activity BEYOND Four Months	
		N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,164	865	74.3	65	5.6

- The first occurring activity (either at or following program intake) was used for the analysis of this criterion.
- Educational activities include vocational education, and training activities include Work First.
- When a participant was involved in more than one activity simultaneously, the following order of priority was established: educational activity (i.e., completion of high school and/or GED attainment and/or college), followed by employment and training.

CRITERION #10: Eighty-five percent (85%) of participants will be involved in school and/or work full-time six months after completion/termination of the program.

Note: The population under discussion in Criterion #10 is different from that associated with the cohort analysis that makes up the bulk of this report. Information used for the “follow-up” on closed cases (Criterion #10) originates from a monthly report completed by the TPP agency (see discussion below).

The TPP agencies began collecting follow-up data about former program participants in April 2006 (i.e., for those cases that closed in October 2005), and every month thereafter. During the sixth month after closure, the TPP agency attempts to locate/contact/complete the data collection process. Numerous attempts to locate and contact the former participants are made, ranging from (1) sending a letter to the last known address, (2) calling the last known telephone number, (3) visiting the last known address, (4) inquiring at the last known workplace/school, (5) all of the aforementioned, and/or (6) participant's whereabouts unknown.

Follow-up data collected by the TPP agencies revealed that, overall, **82.0%** of former participants, who were successfully located and contacted for data collection purposes, were involved in educational, skills training, and/or employment activities six months after case closure.

⁹ *CRITERION #2: The APR06 cohort had eleven additional individuals involved in an activity; however, the time frame was indeterminate.*

Month Closed	Number Closed	Six Month Follow-Up Period (Reporting Month)	Number Successfully Contacted		Involved in Educational, Skills Training, and/or Employment Activities Six Months After Closing to Program ¹⁰	
			n	%	n	%
October 2005	53	April 2006	23	43.4	23	100.0
November 2005	51	May 2006	12	23.5	9	75.0
December 2005	52	June 2006	26	50.0	20	76.9
January 2006	25	July 2006	15	60.0	11	73.3
February 2006	49	August 2006	18	36.7	14	77.8
March 2006	69	September 2006	15	21.7	12	80.0
April 2006	54	October 2006	19	35.2	16	84.2
Overall (Totals)	353		128	36.3	105	82.0

Details about those employed six months after leaving the Teen Parent Program revealed the following average weekly hours of employment and average hourly wage:

Month Closed	Number Closed	Six Month Follow-Up Period (Reporting Month)	Number Successfully Contacted		Number Currently Employed (as of Reporting Month)		Average Number of Hours Per Week	Average Hourly Wage
			n	%	n	%	n	\$
October 2005	53	April 2006	23	43.4	13	56.5	27.6	7.01
November 2005	51	May 2006	12	23.5	5	41.7	30.8	5.37
December 2005	52	June 2006	26	50.0	12	46.2	34.1	7.83
January 2006	25	July 2006	15	60.0	6	40.0	26.7	7.16
February 2006	50	August 2006	18	36.0	7	38.9	35.7	6.73
March 2006	69	September 2006	15	21.7	3	20.0	20.0	6.50
April 2006	54	October 2006	19	35.2	8	42.1	28.4	7.90
Overall (Totals)	353		128	36.3	54	42.2	29.0	6.93

B. PREGNANCY-RELATED CONCERNS

CRITERION #3: Eighty-five percent (85%) of the participating teen parents who are not pregnant at the time of program entry will not become pregnant within twelve (12) months of program entry.

¹⁰ CRITERION #10: Five additional individuals, while not involved in educational, skills training and/or employment activities at the six-month mark, had earned a high school diploma (3) or GED certificate (2) sometime during the six-month period following program closure.

Report Month/Year ¹¹	Number NOT pregnant at program entry	Did NOT experience repeat pregnancy within 12 months of program entry	
		N	%
Apr06	551	479	86.9

- Removing the twelve month time frame from the analysis reveals that 17.2% of those who were **NOT** pregnant at intake experienced a repeat pregnancy.
- Meanwhile, further analysis of those who **were pregnant** at intake, regardless of twelve month time frame, reveals that 11.0% did experience a repeat pregnancy.
- Overall, 13.8% of participants (regardless of pregnancy status at intake and regardless of twelve month time frame) did experience a repeat pregnancy. Note: 8.1% of these teens were married.
- It should be noted that, in terms of statewide data¹², 25.1% of live births occurring in 2004 (the most recent data available), to mothers age 15-20, were subsequent births. In those twenty counties with Teen Parent Programs, 25.8% of live births occurring in 2004, to mothers age 15-20, were subsequent births.

CRITERION #4: Ninety percent (90%) of the teen mothers who are pregnant at the time of program entry will participate in prenatal care.

Report Month/Year	Number pregnant at program entry	Participation in Prenatal Care ¹³	
		N	%
Apr06	604	593	99.2

CRITERION #5: Seventy-five percent (75%) of the teen parents who are pregnant at the time of program entry will deliver full-term infants.

Report Month/Year	Number pregnant at program entry and giving birth by report Month/Yr	Delivery of Full-Term Infants	
		N	%
Apr06	431	386	89.6

¹¹ CRITERION #3: The APR06 cohort had eight individuals who were not pregnant at program entry, but did experience a repeat pregnancy, yet the time frame was indeterminate.

¹² Source: Michigan Department of Community Health, Vital Records and Health Data Development Section.

¹³ CRITERION #4: The APR06 cohort had six cases that were missing prenatal information.

C. HEALTH & PARENTING ISSUES

CRITERION #6: Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parent's children/infants¹⁴ will be referred and/or receive comprehensive medical examinations and immunizations within two (2) months of entry into the Teen Parent Program.

1. Immunizations:

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for Immunizations	Referral and/or Receipt of Immunizations AT INTAKE or WITHIN Two Months of Program Entry		Referral and/or Receipt of Immunizations BEYOND Two Months of Program Entry	
		N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,025	695	67.8	247	24.1

- Attaching a time frame to receipt of immunizations may not be the most effective measure, as immunizations coincide with the birth of the baby, which may or may not coincide with a teen's entry into the program. As such, removing the two-month time frame from the analysis (i.e., including those who were referred for or became involved in the service beyond the two-month mark) reveals the following referral/participation percentage amongst those eligible for the service: 91.9%.

2. Comprehensive Medical Examinations:

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for Comprehensive Medical Examinations	Referral and/or Receipt of Service AT INTAKE or WITHIN Two Months of Program Entry		Referral and/or Receipt of Service BEYOND Two Months of Program Entry	
		N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,000	654	65.4	238	23.8

- With respect to comprehensive medical examinations, many of the teen parent providers have asserted that, while they are able to make referrals, they often have a difficult time accessing HMOs for information regarding actual appointments.
- Attaching a time frame to receipt of well-baby/medical examinations may not be the most effective measure, as such visits coincide with the birth of the baby, which may or may not coincide with a teen's entry into the program. As such, removing the two-month time frame from the analysis (i.e., including

¹⁴ CRITERION #6: Data collection regarding participation related to immunizations and comprehensive medical examinations focused on the youngest child in the family.

those who were referred for or began medical examinations beyond the two-month mark) reveals the following referral/participation percentage amongst those eligible for the service: 89.2%.

CRITERION #7: Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teen parents and/or their children ages 0-3 years will be referred and/or receive child development and parenting education within three months of program entry¹⁵.

1. Child Development Education:

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for Child Development Education	Referral and/or Receipt of Service AT INTAKE or WITHIN Three Months of Program Entry		Referral and/or Receipt of Service BEYOND Three Months of Program Entry	
		N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,111	979	88.1	57	5.1

2. Parenting Education:

Report Month/Year	Number Eligible for Parenting Education	Referral and/or Receipt of Service AT INTAKE or WITHIN Three Months of Program Entry		Referral and/or Receipt of Service BEYOND Three Months of Program Entry	
		N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,154	1,049	90.9	51	4.4

CRITERION #8: Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parents will not have a “preponderance of evidence” child abuse or neglect finding for one (1) year from date of entry into the program.

A data pull on the unduplicated count of teen parent participants (n=1,079) resulted in the acquisition of 1,006 valid recipient Ids (RIDs) from the DHS data

¹⁵ *CRITERION #7: Examples of activities related to child development and parenting education include the following: parenting classes (through the TPP agency, local hospital, High School), group meetings (play groups/family groups), reading materials (pamphlets, handouts, activity sheets, books), videos, Infant Support Services, nutrition classes, Ages and Stages curriculum, on-line resources, Early Headstart, ongoing education provided by TPP (one-on-one sessions, home visits), breast feeding class, Early-On, San Angelo handouts, Healthy Start, HELP curriculum, Parents As Teachers, Mom's group, Dad's group, Step by Step, Family Place, Love & Logic, “Read me a story group”, Motivation for Mothers conference, car seat safety, READY kit, education activity box from the school, Partners for a Healthy Baby, Learning123, Project Momma, workshops, etc.*

warehouse. In turn, these RIDs were used to acquire information related to Protective Services (PS). More specifically, 375 of these RIDs appeared in the Department's Protective Services Management Information System (PSMIS).

Please note that the actual number of TPP participants involved in the protective services analysis that follows is 1,092. This base number includes necessary duplications (i.e., cases that closed and reopened later with the same provider; cases that closed with one provider, only to open later with another, etc.).

1. Protective Services Contact **Within** One Year of TPP Entry¹⁶

- Of the 1,092 participants, 1,063 or 97.3% did NOT have a “preponderance of evidence” (i.e., substantiated) child abuse/neglect finding within one year of entering the program.

Substantiated Protective Services Contact WITHIN One Year of TPP Entry				
Number of TPP Participants	No Protective Services Contact		Protective Services Contact	
	N	%	N	%
1,092	1,063	97.3	29	2.7

- Twenty-nine or 2.7% of the teen parents did have a “preponderance of evidence” finding within one year of entering the program. These twenty-nine individuals were associated with thirty-five events.
 - Further analysis of those twenty-nine substantiated cases reveals that, in terms of roles, three (10.3%) were victims, twenty-two (75.9%) were perpetrators, and ten (34.5%) were uninvolved in the substantiated case¹⁷ (i.e., they were neither a perpetrator nor a victim in the substantiated case).
 - The twenty-two events as perpetrators involved eighteen participants. Those eighteen participants represent 1.6% of the population under study. Thus, in all actuality, **98.4% did not** experience a substantiated abuse/neglect finding, as a perpetrator, within one year of program entry.

2. Protective Services Contact **Prior** to TPP Entry¹⁸

Additional examination of the historical data revealed that a number of participants had a history of contact with Protective Services prior to entering the Teen Parent Program.

¹⁶ Note: There were two additional individuals who had a “preponderance of evidence” finding within one year of TPP entry; however, their role in the event was undetermined.

¹⁷ Note: the total does not equal 100.0% due to the occurrence of multiple incidents (e.g., a teen parent participant may have been involved in more than one incident, taking on more than one role). This holds true for subsequent discussions of “role” (i.e., discussions associated with the historical analysis and the analysis focusing on one year after TPP enrollment and six months after TPP closure).

¹⁸ Note: There were twelve additional individuals who had a “preponderance of evidence” finding prior to TPP entry, however, their role in the event was undetermined.

- Specifically, of the 1,092 participants used in the analysis, 228 (20.9%) did have a “preponderance of evidence” (i.e., substantiated) child abuse/neglect finding prior to program entry. Those 228 individuals were associated with 511 events.

Substantiated Protective Services Contact PRIOR to TPP Entry				
Number of TPP Participants	No Protective Services Contact		Protective Services Contact	
	N	%	N	%
1,092	864	79.1	228	20.9

- Further analysis of those 228 substantiated cases reveals that, in terms of roles, 336 (147.4%) were victims, forty-four (19.3%) were perpetrators, and 131 (57.5%) were uninvolved in the substantiated case.
- The forty-four events as perpetrators involved thirty-five individuals. Those thirty-five individuals represent 3.2% of the population under study.

3. Protective Services Contact **Beyond** the One-Year Mark¹⁹

Meanwhile, further examination of the data reveals that 1.6% (18) of the participants experienced a “preponderance of evidence” (i.e., substantiated) finding beyond the one-year mark in the program. Those eighteen individuals were associated with twenty events.

Substantiated Protective Services Contact BEYOND One Year of TPP Entry				
Number of TPP Participants	No Protective Services Contact		Protective Services Contact	
	N	%	N	%
1,092	1,074	98.4	18	1.6

- Further analysis of those eighteen substantiated cases reveals that, in terms of role, none were victims, sixteen (88.9%) were perpetrators and four (22.2%) were uninvolved in the substantiated case.
- The sixteen events as perpetrators involved fifteen individuals. Those fifteen individuals represent 1.4% of the population under study.

4. Referrals Only

In terms of PS referrals that did not result in “preponderance of evidence” findings or substantiation, 347 individuals or 31.8% of the population under study

¹⁹ Note: There were three additional individuals who had a “preponderance of evidence” finding beyond one year of TPP entry; however, their role in the event was undetermined.

did experience referrals to Protective Services at one time or another. Again, these referrals were not substantiated.

CRITERION #11: Ninety percent (90%) of the teen parents will not have a “preponderance of evidence” finding of child abuse or neglect six months following completion of services.

A data pull on the unduplicated count of “former” teen parent participants (n=333) included in the Apr06 cohort resulted in the identification of 144 of these participants in the Department’s Protective Services Management Information System (PSMIS).

1. Protective Services Contact **Within** Six Months of TPP Closure²⁰

- Of the 333 former program participants, 328 or 98.5% did NOT have a “preponderance of evidence” (i.e., substantiated) child abuse/neglect finding within six months of completing services.

Substantiated Protective Services Contact WITHIN Six Months of Closure				
Number of TPP Participants	No Protective Services Contact		Protective Services Contact	
	N	%	N	%
333	328	98.5	5	1.5

- Five or 1.5% of the teen parents did have a “preponderance of evidence” finding within six months of completing services.
 - Further analysis of those five substantiated cases reveals that there were six events, in all of which the individual was identified as the perpetrator.
 - Again, these six events as perpetrators involved five individuals. Those five individuals represent 1.5% of the population under study (meaning **98.5% did not** experience a substantiated abuse/neglect finding, as a perpetrator, within six months of program closure).

2. Protective Services Contact **more than** Six Months after Case Closure

Meanwhile, further examination of the data reveals that one (0.3%) former participant experienced a “preponderance of evidence” (i.e., substantiated) finding beyond the six month mark (i.e., more than six months after case closure).

²⁰ Note: There was one additional individual who had a “preponderance of evidence” finding within six months of TPP closure; however, their role in the event was undetermined.

Substantiated Protective Services Contact more than six months after Closure				
Number of Former TPP Participants	No Protective Services Contact		Protective Services Contact	
	N	%	N	%
333	332	99.7	1	0.3

- Further analysis of that one substantiated case revealed that the individual was a perpetrator.

D. PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION

CRITERION #9: Seventy-five percent (75%) of participants will self-report satisfaction with services provided by the program.

Beginning with the second quarter of FY06 (i.e., January 2006 – March 2006), TPP agencies²¹ started distributing satisfaction surveys to active TPP participants and reporting the overall results to DHS Central Office on a quarterly basis.

- During Q2, there were 1,034 active TPP participants. Surveys were distributed to 601 (58.4%) of those participants, with 468 (77.9%) of them completing and returning the surveys for analysis.
- 381 respondents (**83.2%**) indicated they were “very satisfied” with the services they’ve received through the program thus far. An additional seventy-five respondents (**16.4%**) indicated they were “somewhat satisfied” with the services received.
- Two respondents (0.4%) indicated they were not satisfied with the program. One stated “I’m not satisfied because I feel she don’t help me that much”, while the other stated “I cannot get around like I need to”.

Additional information stemming from the satisfaction surveys includes the following:

- Age of respondents: 16.1% were sixteen years of age or younger, 20.8% were seventeen years of age, and 63.1% were eighteen years of age or older.
- Length of time in program²²: 4.5% had been in the program less than one month, 34.0% had been in the program 1-6 months, 23.6% had been in the program 7-12 months, 26.0% had been in the program more than one year, and 11.9% had been in the program more than two years.

²¹ CRITERION #9: Three sites did not distribute participant satisfaction surveys in Q2 of FY06.

²² CRITERION #9: Reminder - The new contract began October 1, 2005, and involved twelve new provider agencies and two new counties.

- Frequencies of meetings with caseworker: 4.9% reported they meet (face-to-face) with their caseworker more than once a week, 23.6% reported once a week meetings, 25.3% once every two weeks, 9.2% once every three weeks, and 35.2% once a month.
- Enough contact with caseworker: When asked if they felt this was enough contact with their caseworker, 88.1% indicated that it was, while 6.0% indicated it was NOT. In addition, 1.1% indicated it was too much and 4.8% “didn’t know”.

In addition, respondents were asked to indicate how helpful the Teen Parent Program has been in seven broad areas of service. The results appear in the table below:

The Teen Parent Program helps me with the following: <small>(Note: those indicating they “did not need help” were removed before calculating the remaining percentages)</small>	Helped me a lot	Helped me a little	I did not need help	Did not help as much as I needed	No Response
find the community resources I need	343 (79.8%)	83 (19.3%)	32 (6.9%)	4 (0.9%)	6
follow through with my employment goals	305 (79.2%)	77 (20.0%)	73 (15.9%)	3 (0.8%)	10
follow through with my education goals	329 (84.1%)	55 (14.1%)	52 (11.7%)	7 (1.8%)	25
learn about parenting and child development	396 (90.0%)	43 (9.8%)	22 (4.8%)	1 (0.2%)	6
make responsible reproductive health decisions through information including sexuality and AIDS	305 (85.4%)	49 (13.7%)	100 (21.9%)	3 (0.8%)	11
maintain well baby care/immunizations	322 (87.0%)	46 (12.4%)	88 (19.2%)	2 (0.5%)	10
provides information about life options including marriage and adoption	231 (76.2%)	68 (22.4%)	151 (33.3%)	4 (1.3%)	14

SECTION II:
**EDUCATIONAL & EMPLOYMENT PURSUITS IN FURTHER
DETAIL**

Closer examination of the program participants based on their educational status at intake is presented below. This discussion attempts to provide an indication of the level of continuity that exists with respect to the educational pursuits of the teens. Also included is a discussion of employment.

A. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: DROP OUT²³

Report Mo/Yr	Number of TPP Participants	Number Missing Educational Status	Educational Status at Intake: Drop Out		Enrolled in School at Report Date		Not Enrolled in School at Report Date	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,164	23	382	33.5	75	20.1	298	79.9

- Approximately one-third of the participants (33.5%) reportedly were not engaged in an educational activity at the time they entered the teen parent program.
- By the reporting period, approximately one-fifth of that “drop out” group (20.1%) was reportedly enrolled in school.

Report Mo/Yr	Educational Status at Intake: Drop Out	Enrolled in School at Report Date	Enrollment was Continuous ²⁴		Not Enrolled in School at Report Date	Not Enrolled because earned diploma or GED		Not Enrolled because of barriers beyond the participant’s control	
			N	%		N	%	N	%
Apr06	382	75	57	77.0	298	31	10.4	53	17.8

- For more than three-fourths of those “re-enrolled” teens (77.0%), their enrollment was continuous (i.e., no excessive breaks/absences).
- Approximately ten percent (10.4%) of those not enrolled at intake (or at report date) had enrolled in school or GED training/classes and had earned their high school diploma or GED by the report date.
- Of those not enrolled at intake or at the report date(s), 17.8% cited barriers to enrollment which were beyond their control. In general terms, these reported barriers, presented here and in subsequent tables throughout the discussion in Section II, concern such things as transportation, child care, lack of familial support, housing issues, and medical issues. More specifically, some of the identified barriers were as follows:

²³ The APR06 cohort was missing enrollment information, as of report date, for nine individuals who were “drop outs” at program entry.

²⁴ The APR06 cohort was missing information about continuity of enrollment for one case.

- lack of transportation
- lack of child care
- unstable housing/homelessness
- high risk pregnancy (home bound; doctor ordered bed rest)
- health problems (of teen, teen's child and/or other family members; includes physical, emotional, and mental health issues; caring for special needs child)
- death in family (i.e., parent, child, other relative, etc.)
- required/needs to work (e.g., Work First; needs to support family; work schedule does not permit school)
- too young to take GED examination
- cannot enroll in GED classes until baby is six weeks old
- family will not consent to teen's enrollment in school
- probation officer and counselor recommend client focus on substance abuse treatment as opposed to educational pursuits
- school district administrative issues (e.g., GED program has no vacancies; GED program closed; no special education program in area for which client qualifies; etc.)

B. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: ENROLLED IN SCHOOL²⁵

Report Mo/Yr	Number of TPP Participants	Number Missing Educational Status	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in School		Enrolled at Report Date		Not Enrolled at Report Date	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,164	23	538	47.2	351	66.5	177	33.5

- Almost one-half of the program participants (47.2%) were enrolled in school at the time of program entry.
- Two-thirds (66.5%) of the participants who were enrolled at intake were still enrolled in school as of the report date, with the overwhelming majority of them experiencing continuous enrollment (81.4%).

²⁵ The APR06 cohort was missing enrollment information, as of report date, for ten individuals who were enrolled in school at program entry.

Report Mo/Yr	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in School	Enrolled at Report Date	Enrollment was Continuous ²⁶		Not Enrolled at Report Date	Not Enrolled because earned diploma or GED		Not Enrolled because of barriers beyond the participant's control	
			N	%		N	%	N	%
Apr06	538	351	281	81.4	177	67	37.9	22	12.4

- Of those participants who were enrolled in school at program entry but not enrolled as of the subsequent reporting period, over one-third (37.9%) were not enrolled because they had earned their high school diploma or GED certificate.

C. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: GED TRAINING/CLASSES²⁷

Report Mo/Yr	Number of TPP Participants	Number Missing Educational Status	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in GED Training / Classes		Enrolled at Report Date		Not Enrolled at Report Date	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,164	23	28	2.5	20	74.1	7	25.9

- Only a small percentage of the participants (2.5%) were identified as being enrolled in GED training/classes at the time of program entry, with 74.1% of those still enrolled as of the report date.

Report Mo/Yr	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in GED Training / Classes	Enrolled at Report Date	Enrollment was Continuous		Not Enrolled at Report Date	Not Enrolled because earned diploma or GED		Not Enrolled because of barriers beyond the participant's control	
			N	%		N	%	N	%
Apr06	28	20	12	60.0	7	4	57.1	0	0.0

- Meanwhile, three-fifths (60.0%) of the individuals who were enrolled in GED training/classes both at intake and at report date experienced continuous enrollment.
- 57.1% of those individuals who were in GED training/classes at intake but not at the report date had successfully earned a GED certificate.

²⁶ The APR06 cohort was missing information about continuity of enrollment for one case.

²⁷ The APR06 cohort was missing enrollment information, as of report date, for one individual who was enrolled in GED training/classes at program entry.

D. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: ENROLLED IN SCHOOL AND GED TRAINING/CLASSES²⁸

Report Mo/Yr	Number of TPP Participants	Number Missing Educational Status	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in School & GED Training / Classes		Enrolled at Report Date		Not Enrolled at Report Date	
			N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,164	23	17	1.5	11	73.3	4	26.7

- A small percentage of individuals (1.5%) were reportedly enrolled in both school and GED training/classes (at program entry).
- Of this dually enrolled group, 73.3% was still enrolled as of the report date(s).

Report Mo/Yr	Educational Status at Intake: Enrolled in School & GED Training / Classes	Enrolled at Report Date	Enrollment was Continuous ²⁹		Not Enrolled at Report Date	Not Enrolled because earned diploma or GED		Not Enrolled because of barriers beyond the participant's control	
		N	N	%	N	N	%	N	%
Apr06	28	22	8	80.0	4	0	0.0	3	75.0

- Of those still enrolled at the report date(s), 80.0% was experiencing continuous enrollment.
- Meanwhile, 75.0% of those who were not enrolled at the report date were not enrolled because of barriers beyond their control.

E. EDUCATIONAL STATUS AT INTAKE: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE OR GED HOLDER

- 156 individuals (13.7%) were identified as either high school graduates or GED holders at program entry.
- Specifically, 10.0% were high school graduates; 1.6% were GED holders; and 2.1% were high school graduates and/or GED holders and attending college at program entry.

²⁸ The APR06 cohort was missing enrollment information, as of report date, for two individuals who were enrolled in both school and GED training/classes at program entry.

²⁹ The APR06 cohort was missing information about continuity of enrollment for one case.

F. EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT INTAKE AND AT REPORT DATE

For the Apr06 cohort, the number of participants employed by the report date increased considerably (91.8%).

Report Mo/Yr	Valid Number of Participants ³⁰	Number Employed at Intake		Valid Number of Participants ³¹	Number Employed at Report Date		Increase in Number Employed	
		N	%		N	%	N	%
Apr06	1,147	97	8.5	1,117	186	16.7	89	91.8

Those participants who were employed as of the report date may further be described as follows:

Report Mo/Yr	Number Employed at Report Date		Number who were also employed at Intake		Number who were NOT employed at Intake	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr06	186	16.7	51	27.4	135	72.6

- More than one-quarter of the participants (27.4%) who were employed as of the report date had also been employed at intake.
- Just under three-quarters of the participants (72.6%) who were employed as of the report date had NOT been employed at intake.

³⁰ The APR06 cohort was missing intake employment information for 17 cases.

³¹ The APR06 cohort was missing report date employment information for 47 cases.

SECTION III:
ADDITIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

The teen parent provider agencies provide a number of additional support services to the program participants. These services were identified as being delivered in one of six ways: directly by the TPP agency, by sub-contract, by way of referral, or by some combination of the aforementioned.

In terms of **direct** service provision (or some combination thereof), the TPP agencies provided 80.0% or more of the following services:

- Transportation (97.2% of these services provided directly by the TPP agencies).
- Support Groups (95.5%)
- Parenting Classes (91.4%)
- Nutrition Classes (88.0%)
- Emergency Services/24-Hour Crisis Intervention (84.4%)
- Teen Father Services (83.3%)
- Transitional Housing (80.7%)
- Substance Abuse Services (80.6%)

Child Birth / Prenatal Classes															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	253	21.7%	101	39.9%	3	1.2%	115	45.5%	3	1.2%	30	11.9%	1	0.4%

Child Care															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	226	19.4%	38	16.8%	6	2.7%	128	56.6%	2	0.9%	52	23.0%	0	0.0%

Domestic Violence Services															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	136	11.7%	63	46.3%	0	0.0%	55	40.4%	2	1.5%	16	11.8%	0	0.0%

Emergency Services / 24-Hour Crisis Intervention															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	681	58.5%	549	80.6%	1	0.1%	105	15.4%	2	0.3%	24	3.5%	0	0.0%

Family Planning															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	562	48.3%	292	52.0%	5	0.9%	169	30.1%	95	16.9%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%

Food Bank															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	392	33.7%	206	52.6%	9	2.3%	149	38.0%	1	0.3%	27	6.9%	0	0.0%

Housing Search															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	485	41.7%	318	65.6%	1	0.2%	114	23.5%	1	0.2%	50	10.3%	1	0.2%

Legal Assistance															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	105	9.0%	33	31.4%	0	0.0%	63	60.0%	0	0.0%	9	8.6%	0	0.0%

Life Options Counseling															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	84	7.2%	52	61.9%	0	0.0%	17	20.2%	0	0.0%	15	17.9%	0	0.0%

Mental Health Counseling															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	238	20.4%	94	39.5%	3	1.3%	106	44.5%	3	1.3%	30	12.6%	2	0.8%

Nutrition Classes															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	434	37.3%	309	71.2%	14	3.2%	38	8.8%	7	1.6%	66	15.2%	0	0.0%

Parenting Classes															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	694	59.6%	579	83.4%	9	1.3%	51	7.3%	4	0.6%	51	7.3%	0	0.0%

Substance Abuse Services															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	67	5.8%	46	68.7%	1	1.5%	11	16.4%	0	0.0%	8	11.9%	1	1.5%

Support Groups															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	538	46.2%	501	93.1%	0	0.0%	24	4.5%	4	0.7%	9	1.7%	0	0.0%

Transitional Housing															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	166	14.3%	121	72.9%	0	0.0%	32	19.3%	0	0.0%	13	7.8%	0	0.0%

Transportation															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	888	76.3%	826	93.0%	1	0.1%	24	2.7%	5	0.6%	32	3.6%	0	0.0%

Teen Father Services															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	294	25.3%	209	71.1%	0	0.0%	49	16.7%	2	0.7%	34	11.6%	0	0.0%

Volunteers / Mentors															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	131	11.3%	92	70.2%	2	1.5%	36	27.5%	1	0.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Other Support Services (up to three responses allowed, therefore total may not equal 100.0%)															
Report Mo/Yr	Number in Teen Parent Program	Number Receiving Service		TPP Agency		Sub-Contract		Referral		TPP Agency & Sub-Contract		TPP Agency & Referral		Sub-Contract & Referral	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Apr-06	1164	508	43.6%	340	66.9%	10	2.0%	210	41.3%	3	0.6%	36	7.1%	1	0.2%

“Other” support services include the following:

1. Material Assistance: baby items (stroller, crib, diapers, car seat, baby pantry etc.), household items, clothing (including maternity clothes), Christmas gifts/Holiday giving program, furniture, car repair, and incentive store.
2. Medical Related: counseling, WIC, smoking cessation materials, information about “safe sleep”, and Maternal and Infant Health Program.
3. Education/Training Related: Early-On, Early Headstart, budgeting classes, tutoring (e.g., GED tutor services), home school material, infant care, housing safety, Individualized Education Plan (IEP), college prep (e.g., college entrance services), Michigan Works program, Life Skills training, Early Childhood Literacy program, special education for child, leadership group, Teen Age Parent Program (TAPP), vocational planning, employment search, Eco-Map (ID’s areas in life that are stressors), etc.

4. Community Resources/Groups: "211", Salvation Army, Family Youth Intervention, Women in Need of Guidance (WINGS), community resource list, networking, etc.
5. Other Services: liaison (with DHS, juvenile officer, etc.), county probation program, document acquisition (i.e., driver's license, social security card), and help with SSI application process.

SECTION IV:
REASONS BEHIND CASE CLOSURES

Reasons for case closure were obtained from a multiple response question in which up to three possible explanations could be cited. The results are shown below.

Reason for Closure	Apr06 Cohort	
	371 cases closed	
	N	%
Client quit	85	22.9
Inactivity on behalf of client	194	52.3
Client's goals and objectives were attained	48	12.9
Client no longer eligible due to age	67	18.1
Client moved out of service area	38	10.2
Other	51	13.7
Totals ³²	483	130.9

- Given that the Teen Parent Program is, for the most part, a voluntary program³³, it is not surprising to learn that 75.2% of the 371 cases that were closed indicated they were closed either because the participant quit or because of inactivity on behalf of the client.
- 28.3% of the closed cases were closed either because of “aging out” of the program or moving out of the service area.
- The “other” response, which was selected in 13.7% of the closed cases, included such reasons for closure as the following:
 - Participant incarcerated.
 - Participant no longer parenting (e.g., gave custody of baby to relative; baby adopted by relatives; client turned out not to be pregnant).
 - Participant's parent/family objects to program participation.
 - Participant's work and school hours conflict with time available to see advocate (i.e., scheduling conflicts).
 - Participant moved into transitional housing/teen living center and/or receives services through other programs (e.g., Teen Living Center, St. Rita's program, Alternatives for Girls Housing program, Healthy Connections and Even Start).
 - Unable to locate participant (e.g., participant moved and left no forwarding address, etc.).
 - Participant received services for a number of years (e.g., three years).
 - Participant completed program as part of their probation requirement.
 - Participant's DHS case closed.
 - Participant lives in a “no travel” zone.
- 12.9% of the closed cases indicated that the client's goals and objectives were attained.

³² Given that the data stem from a multiple response question, the total “N” exceeds the number of case closures, and the total percentages add up to over 100.0%.

³³ Minor Grantees living in counties that operate the Teen Parent Program are expected to participate therein.